

PERSONAL AND JOB-RELATED FACTORS AS ANTECEDENTS OF ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT: A CASE OF MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

ŽIVILĖ STANKEVIČIŪTĖ, EGLĖ STANIŠKIENĖ

Abstract

Organisational commitment has gained increasing attention over the past four decades. According to the three-component model, organisational commitment is treated as a psychological state reflecting a desire, a need and an obligation to remain with the organisation. There is a substantial body of evidence demonstrating the potential benefits to organisations of having strongly committed employees. While numerous studies analyse the outcomes, the antecedents of organisational commitment are less well-studied, especially considering differing work settings. The purpose of this paper is to disclose personal and job-related factors that shape the organisational commitment among employees working in manufacturing industry. In doing this, quantitative data were collected from a manufacturing organisation using a survey. Contrary to the proposed hypotheses, the survey indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between personal factors (age, gender, education level, marital status, and kinship responsibilities) and organisational commitment. Meanwhile, job-related factors (supervisor support, co-worker support, role clarity, and access to resources) were indicated as determinants having a significant impact on organisational commitment. Such results highlight the important directions for implementing strategies to increase the organisational commitment of employees working in manufacturing industry.

Key words: organisational commitment, antecedents, manufacturing, personal characteristics, job-related characteristics.

Classification JEL: M12 – Personnel Management.

1. Introduction

Although the notion of ‘job for life’ is outdated (*D’Amato & Herzfeldt, 2008*) and the traditional employment system is changing (*Cappelli, 2000*), organisational commitment (OC) continues to receive huge attention from both researchers and practitioners (*Kell & Motowidlo, 2012; Meyer, Stanley & Vandenberg, 2013; Devece, Palacios-Marques & Alguacil, 2016; Schrock et al., 2016; Vanhala, Heilmann & Salminen, 2016*). An essential reason for such attention is the fact that empirical evidence demonstrate the benefits the organisations and the employees are enjoying due to a strongly committed workforce (*Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001; Meyer et al., 2002; Somers, 2009; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016*). Given this, it is obvious that OC contributes to the so-desirable ‘win-win’ situation in the employee-employer interaction (*Meyer & Maltin, 2010*). This means the organisations are encouraged to consider OC as a key part of human resource management (*Choi, Oh & Colbert, 2015*). In doing this, it is not sufficient to analyse the outcomes (consequences) of OC; examining the antecedents of OC is similarly important (*Iverson & Buttigieg, 1999; Morrow, 2011; Choi et al., 2015*). Answers to the prevailing question about the factors that shape OC would open the space for businesses to “establish and restore organisational commitment among employees” (*Morrow, McElroy & Scheibe, 2012*) in contemporary work settings.

Until now, the majority of research has focused on the link between OC and various outcome variables (*Culpepper, 2011*), whereas the antecedents of OC are less well explored (*Joiner & Bakalis, 2006*). Although a constantly growing number of studies deal with factors, which foster OC, nonetheless the results show some discrepancies (*Iverson & Buttigieg, 1999; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016*). Disparate findings do not propose clear practical implications for business concerning the ways to enhance and maintain OC. Moreover, prior studies analyse the

antecedents of OC in a particular economic industry or with particular professions: high-tech industries (*Chin & Lin, 2009*), sales performance (*Schrock et al., 2016*) or hospital nurses (*Somers, 2009*), leaving the manufacturing field mainly apart. Meanwhile, the European Commission considers manufacturing as a driver of growth and employment and set a target that manufacturing should represent 20% of the total value added in the EU by 2020 (*EPRS, 2015*). To address the mentioned problems and to close the gaps, there is the need to study the antecedents of OC within the steadily changing employment system and work environment (*Cappelli, 2000*) in a particular relevant industry.

The aim of the paper is to disclose personal and job-related factors that shape OC among employees working in the manufacturing industry. The paper is based on the survey of employees working in a manufacturing company.

The added value of this paper lies in its contribution to literature by the exploring the antecedents of OC. More specifically, the paper suggests that the factors shaping OC should not be underestimated by managing OC in ways that will serve both employees and employers. The paper contributes to the stream of literature by exploring the determinants of OC in a particular field that is highly relevant for the EU – manufacturing. The research provides empirical evidence encouraging the manufacturing organisations to invest in job-related factors.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. The second section gives an overview of the literature on OC and the antecedents of OC. Personal and job-related factors such as the antecedents of OC are later described and the hypotheses are formulated. The third section describes the research method that was applied. The fourth section presents the empirical results. Further, the discussion is provided. Finally, conclusions are drawn.

2. Organisational commitment and its dimensionality

During the last 40 years, considerable progress was made in the field of OC allowing to define OC as a ‘mature construct’ (*Morrow, 2011*). However, as usually is in management literature and practice, there remains a disagreement about what OC is, its dimensionality, how it develops, and how it affects employees and organisations. The outcomes of OC are beyond the scope of this paper; however, other three aspects are, to a different degree, the objects of analyses presented in the paper.

Over the years, commitment has been defined in many different ways (*Meyer & Herscovitsh, 2001*) and can take various forms, including OC, commitment to other organisations (professions and unions), people (supervisors and teams), and actions (goals and programmes), (*Meyer & Maltin, 2010*). However, in general, the core essence of commitment relies on the fact that commitment is a stabilising or obliging force that gives direction to behaviour (*Meyer & Herscovitsh, 2001*). Having in mind the variety of workplace commitment forms, the paper focuses only on OC, which reflects a certain degree of bonding with the organisation (*Ng, 2015*). The definitions of OC differ in terms of how this bond is considered to have developed (*Mathieu & Zajac, 1990*).

The early conceptualisations of OC were unidimensional, and OC was seen as either attitudinal (*Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979*) or behavioural (*Becker, 1960*). Attitudinal commitment implies one’s emotional attachment to an organisation and represents the degree of loyalty a person has to the organisation (*Porter et al., 1974*). Attitudinal commitment can be characterised by at least three factors: a) strong belief in and acceptance of the organisation’s goals and values; b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organisation; c) and a strong desire to maintain membership in the organisation” (*Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982: 27*). Behavioural commitment, on the contrary, reflects the process by which individuals link themselves to the organisation and focuses on the actions taken by these individuals. It relies on the ‘side-bet theory’ proposed by Becker (*1960*), which states that employees attach themselves to organisations through investments (time, efforts etc.). The cost of these

investments reduce the employee's freedom to some degree and employees get 'locked' within the organisation because of the costs incurred upon leaving. According to the side-bet theory, commitment increases as the number or size of side bets increases (Meyer & Allen, 1984).

As work in the area of OC progressed, new multidimensional frameworks were proposed (for a detailed review see Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). However, Meyer & Allen's (1991) three-component model, including affective, normative and continuance commitment, is one of the best-known and used in management research.

Meyer & Allen (1991: 67) define OC as a "psychological state that a) characterises the employee's relationship with the organisation, and b) has implications for the decision to continue or discontinue membership in the organisation." The employee's attachment to the organisation can be accompanied by different mind-sets and the nature of psychological states differ. Affective commitment refers to an affective attachment and involvement with a target; normative commitment refers to a felt obligation to the target, whereas continuance commitment refers to an awareness of the cost associated with discontinuing involvement with the target (Meyer & Maltin, 2010). As is it seen, the multidimensional OC reflects three themes: a desire, an obligation, and a need. An employee can experience all three forms of commitment to a varying degree; hence, the combination of forms is evident (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

Affective commitment refers to the "employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organisation" (Meyer & Allen, 1991: 67). Affective commitment reflects the desire to remain with the organisation (Meyer, Stanley & Parfyonova, 2012). Individuals with affective commitment identify with the organisation and are committed to pursue its goals (Darolia, Kumari & Darolia, 2010). Furthermore, employees having a strong affective commitment remain in a particular organisation because they want to do so (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

From the viewpoint of the *normative commitment*, Allen & Meyer (1990) emphasised that a less common but equally viable approach is to view OC as a belief about one's responsibilities towards the organisation. Normative commitment is experienced as a sense of obligation to stay (Meyer et al., 2012). According to Meyer & Herscovitch (2001), normative commitment is "the mind-set that one has an obligation to pursue a course of action of relevance to a target" (p. 316). Meyer & Parfyonova (2010) propose that normative commitment has two 'faces' – a moral duty and indebted obligation. Thus, strongly committed employees remain in the organisation because they ought to do so (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Continuance commitment refers to an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Meyer & Herscovitch (2001) described continuance commitment as "the perception that it would be costly to discontinue a course of action" (p. 316). As stated by Allen & Meyer (1990), continuance commitment relies on the 'side-bet theory' accumulating what would be lost if the activity were discontinued. More specifically, continuance commitment occurs when employees feel that they will reap the benefits if they stay and they will incur costs if they leave (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016).

Summing up, the paper treats OC as a multidimensional construct and follows the attitude of Meyer & Allen (1991) that affective, normative and continuance commitments tend to be perceived as components rather than types of OC. Based on that, the next section discusses the antecedents of OC aimed at further understanding of the factors that shape OC.

3. Antecedents of organisational commitment

Antecedents of OC are actions or elements that cause the commitment to occur (Fornes, Rocco & Wollard, 2008). Although the literature provides different sets of antecedents of OC (Table 1), all these antecedents produce employee perceptions that lead to positive consequences for both the organisation and individual (Fornes et al., 2008). Some authors apply the same antecedents of OC as the whole. However, other authors, like Meyer & Allen (1991)

argue that the three components of OC will develop as the function of quite different antecedents and provide them for particular type of OC (Table 1). A brief overview concerning the development in the field of OC antecedents is provided below.

Table 1. Antecedents of OC (based on cited authors)

Author (year)	Source	Antecedents of OC		
		Affective commitment	Normative commitment	Continuance commitment
Mathieu & Zajac (1990)	Meta-analysis (antecedents for all components of OC)	Personal characteristics (age, sex, education, marital status, position tenure, organisational tenure, perceived personal competence, ability, salary, protestant work ethic, job level) Role states (Role ambiguity, role conflict, role overload) Job characteristics (skill variety, task autonomy, challenge, job scale) Group (leader) relations (group cohesiveness, task interdependence, leader initiating structure, leader consideration, leader communication, participative leadership) Organisational characteristics (organisational size, organisational centralisation)		
Meyer & Allen (1991)	Based on literature review (separate antecedents for separate components of OC)	Personal characteristics (Demographic characteristics – age, tenure, sex, education; Personal dispositions (need for achievement, locus of control, personal work ethic etc.) Organisational structure Work experience	Socialisation (cultural, familiar, organisational) Organisational investments	Investments (side bets) Alternatives
Iverson & Buttigieg (1999)	Based on literature review and contextual factors within the organisation	Personal variables (education, tenure in the organisation, tenure in a particular location, kinship responsibilities, job expectations, values, affectivity (positive and negative), and work motivation. Job-related variables (job hazards, autonomy, co-worker and supervisor support, job security, routinisation, stress, promotional opportunities, pay, distributive justice, relationship with management, and experiences of appreciation by the public. Environmental variables , relating to the non-work setting, including industrial relations climate and job opportunities.		
Meyer et al. (2002)	Meta –analysis (antecedents for all components of OC)	Personal characteristics Work experiences	Personal characteristics Socialisation experiences Organisational investments	Personal characteristics Alternatives Investments
Fornes et al. (2008)	Based on literature review	Clarity of purpose, equity and fairness, empowerment, congruency, feedback and recognition, autonomy, and interesting work		

Well-known in the academic literature is a meta-analysis by Mathieu & Zajac (1990), which listed personal characteristics, job characteristics, group-leader relations, organisational characteristics, and role states as antecedents of OC. Later, Iverson & Buttigieg (1999) indicated three large groups of antecedents, namely personal, job-related and environment variables. Further, Meyer et al. (2002) conducted a meta-analysis and concluded that antecedents of OC

included demographic variables, individual differences, work experiences, and alternatives/investments. However, at the same time Meyer & Hersovitch (2001) argued that research concerning antecedents of OC has been largely unsystematic due to the fact that research commonly “examined correlations between commitment and potential antecedent variables without much consideration of *why* these variables should influence commitment” (p. 315). Meyer & Hersovitch (2001) proposed that, when considering the factors shaping OC, it is relevant to distinguish among the mind-sets that accompany OC. The mind-set of normative commitment develops as a result of the internalisation of norms through socialisation, acceptance of the terms of psychological contract and/or the need to reciprocate experienced by the recipient of benefits. In case of continuance commitment, investments (or side bets) that would be lost if a person discontinued the activity and the lack of alternatives are seen as a basis for the development of that commitment. Any personal or situational variable that contributes to the likelihood that a person will be involved in a course of action, recognise the value-relevance of association with an entity and/or derive the identity from association with an entity will be a basis for the development of affective commitment (Meyer & Hersovitch, 2001).

Velano Rodriguez, Crespo Franco & Santos (2006) introduced the idea about *distant and near causes* arguing that distant causes influence OC through their impact on near causes. Organisational characteristics, personal characteristics, human resource strategies and environmental conditions are seen as distant causes, whereas work experiences, ambiguity and conflict rule, and psychological contract are perceived as near causes. Later on, Fornes et al. (2008) introduced clarity of purpose, equity and fairness, empowerment, congruency, feedback and recognition, autonomy, and interesting work as antecedents of OC. Recently, after reviewing of 58 studies, Morrow (2001) created six categories of antecedents for affective OC: socialization, organisational changes, human resource practices, interpersonal relations, employee-organisation relation and other antecedents. This leads to the conclusion that the literature focuses on a variety of situational and experiential antecedents of OC, such as perceived organisational support (Ng, 2015), organisational trust (Ng, 2015; Vanhala et al., 2016), person-organisational fit (Meyer et al, 2010) or on dispositional antecedents (Choi et al., 2015).

The presented paper focuses on two groups of antecedents of OC, namely personal factors and job-related factors.

Personal factors (characteristics) have been one of the most commonly tested antecedents of OC (Joiner & Bakalis, 2006). The arguments for linking personal characteristics with OC were based on both the role theory and exchange theory (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Personal characteristics included in that research were gender, age, education level, marital status and kinship responsibilities.

Research on *gender* and OC has showed inconsistent results (Joiner & Bakalis, 2006; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Mathieu & Zajac (1990) revealed that women were more affectively committed than men. On the contrary, Aydin et al. (2011) found that males had a higher level of commitment than females. However, most of the studies on the relationship between gender and commitment found no significant relation between gender and commitment (Ngo & Tsang, 1998; Joiner & Bakalis, 2006). These arguments suggest that:

Hypothesis 1 (H1). *Gender will not be associated with OC.*

Results on *age* as the antecedents of OC are not unambiguous – some studies found that age was not related to OC, while many researchers established that age was positively related to OC, and there were a few studies that even presented a contrasting finding that age was negatively related to OC (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Cho & Mor Barak (2008) found that older employees had a higher level of commitment than younger employees. Meyer & Allen (1984) explained this providing such reasons as having received better positions and more satisfaction with their jobs. Younger employees are less committed to their organisations because they have

different values (*D'Amato & Herzfeldt, 2008*); they have invested less and have very little history with the organisation as compared to older employees (*Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994*). Given the foregoing, it is suggested that:

Hypothesis 2 (H2): *Age will be positively related to OC.*

Education level has been inversely correlated with OC (*Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Joiner & Bakalis, 2006*). Employees with a higher level of education have greater job options and consequently they are not 'locked' in the organisation, weakening their moral attachment and raising job expectations that are difficult to be met (*Allen & Meyer, 1990; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Mowday et al., 1982*). These arguments suggest that:

Hypothesis 3 (H3): *Education level will be positively related to OC.*

Matieu & Zalac (1990) argue that it is reasonable to predict that *marital status* may be related to OC as married people are likely to have financial burdens. However, some opposite empirical findings are also provided in the literature. *Joiner & Bakalis (2006)* revealed that married academicians were less committed as compared to their unmarried colleagues. Meanwhile, *Chughtai & Zafar (2006)* found that marital status was not related to OC. Still, in general, married people have more family responsibilities and the need to support family constantly makes them more committed (*Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016*). In the light of these explanations, it is hypothesised that:

Hypothesis 4 (H4): *Marital status will be positively related to OC.*

Kinship responsibilities refer to the number of dependents of employees (*Iverson & Buttigieg, 1999*). Knowing that someone depends on one's income would influence the extent an individual feels locked inside the organisation (*Joiner & Bakalis, 2006*). This leads to the idea that employees with greater kinship responsibilities are more reliant on the organisation to fulfil their financial needs (*Iverson & Buttigieg, 1999*). Based on this, it is suggested that:

Hypothesis 5 (H5): *Kinship responsibilities will be positively related to OC.*

Job-related factors refer to practices used by the organisation to assist the employees to understand their job or work role (*Joiner & Bakalis, 2006*). Job-related factors included in the present research were supervisor support, co-worker support, role clarity and access to resources.

In the field of *support of supervisors and co-workers*, *Chughtai & Zafar (2006)* argue that supervisors play a crucial role in the employee-employer linkage. Supervisors influence the employees' perceptions about the organisation's supportiveness. Moreover, supervisors have an impact on the extent to which employees can expect that the organisation will look after their interests. *Mottaz (1988)* revealed that employees who perceived the relationship with their co-workers and supervisors as supportive had a strong positive commitment to the organisation. Strong support from supervisors and co-workers is likely to indicate care, concern and support for the employees (*Joiner & Bakalis, 2006*). In the light of these ideas, it is hypothesised that:

Hypothesis 6: (H6): *Supervisor support will be positively related to OC.*

Hypothesis 7 (H7): *Co-worker support will be positively related to OC.*

Role clarity refers to the sufficiency of information regarding the expectations associated with one's role within the organisation (*Kahn at al., 1964*). As role clarity helps reduce uncertainty regarding the organisation's expectations from employees, researchers have generally considered role clarity as a source of OC (*Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2011*). Therefore, it is hypothesised that:

Hypothesis 8 (H8): *Role clarity will be positively related to OC.*

According to *Spreitzer (1996)*, *access to resources* provides the employee with the necessary means to complete tasks effectively and enhances the employee's sense of control

and self-efficacy. Access to resources is likely to indicate to the employees that the organisation values them, strengthening their OC (Joiner & Bakalis, 2006). Therefore, it is hypothesised:

Hypothesis 9 (H9): Access to resources will be positively related to OC

4. Method

From the point of view of a *sample*, the study was conducted in a manufacturing company. Questionnaires were distributed to 215 employees. There were 109 questionnaires returned.

Organisational commitment was measured using Meyer and Allen's (1997) shortened OC scale (*cit. Fields, 2002*), which includes 18 items. Respondents were requested to indicate their agreement with each statement on a 5-point Likert scale. This instrument measures the three components of OC (Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.924): affective (Cronbach's alpha was 0.901) continuance (Cronbach's alpha was 0.860), and normative (Cronbach's alpha was 0.776) commitment.

Personal factors included in this study were gender (male – 1; female – 2), education (1 – basic; 2 – secondary; 3 – vocational; 4 – higher education; 5 – university degree), marital status (single – 1; married or partnered relationship – 2), and kinship responsibilities (no children – 1; presence of children – 2).

Supervisor support was measured using Greenhaus, Parasuraman & Wormly's scale (*cit. Fields, 2002*), which includes 9 items. Respondents were requested to indicate their agreement with each statement on a 5-point Likert scale. Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.885. *Co-worker support* was measured by a single item, provided by Joiner & Bakalis (2006). Respondents were requested to indicate their agreement with the statement on a 5-point Likert scale. *Access to resources* was measured using one item: "I have access to the resources I need to do my job well." Respondents were requested to indicate their agreement with the statement on a 5-point Likert scale. *Role clarity* was measured using a five-item scale from Rizzo et al. (1970). Respondents were requested to indicate their agreement with each statement on a 5-point Likert scale. Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.082.

4.1. Results

The means, standard deviations for the scales and a correlation matrix are provided in Table 2.

Referring to Table 2, **H1, H2, H3, H4 and H5 were not confirmed**. This means that no significant relationships were found between personal factors such as employees' gender, age, education level, marital status and kinship responsibilities.

H6 was confirmed. Supervisor support was found to have a statistically significant positive effect on OC ($r = 0.647$, $p < 0.01$). Concerning different components of OC, supervisor support has the most significant positive effect on affective commitment ($r = 0.731$, $p < 0.01$) and a less significant effect on continuance commitment ($r = 0.437$, $p < 0.01$).

H7 was confirmed in general. However, referring to different components of OC, no statistically significant relationship was found between the co-worker support and continuance commitment.

H8 was confirmed in the same manner as in the case of H6. A positive relationship was found between the role clarity and OC ($r = 0.565$, $p < 0.01$). The most significant positive effect was regarding the affective commitment ($r = 0.693$, $p < 0.01$) and less significant towards continuance commitment ($r = 0.402$, $p < 0.01$).

In general, **H9 was confirmed**. However, the results do not provide support for statistically significant relationship between the access to resources and normative commitment.

Table 2. Means, Standard deviations and Correlations (own study)

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Personal factors														
1. Age	2.10	0.82												
2. Gender	1.37	0.48	-0.233											
3. Education	2.96	1.16	0.399**	0.025										
4. Marital status	1.58	0.49	0.171	-0.041	0.344**									
5. Kinship responsibilities	1.46	0.50	-0.450**	.0107	-0.336**	-0.409**								
Job-related factors														
6. Supervisor support	3.67	0.76	0.055	-0.001	0.317**	0.032	0.130							
7. Co-workers support	4.06	0.95	-0.137	0.027	0.136	-0.002	0.111	0.526**						
8. Role clarity	3.95	0.64	0.068	0.026	0.250**	0.103	0.021	0.862**	0.288**					
9. Access to resources	4.18	1.01	-0.045	0.141	0.250**	0.079	-0.098	0.347**	0.007	0.522**				
10. Affective commitment	3.16	0.89	-0.024	0.172	0.263	0.073	0.012	0.731**	0.310**	0.693**	0.238*			
11. Continuance commitment	2.68	0.84	0.078	0.159	0.070	0.015	0.060	0.437**	0.110	0.402**	0.261**	0.567**		
12. Normative commitment	2.69	0.76	0.002	0.0113	0.200	-0.023	0.161	0.493**	0.227*	0.411**	0.182	0.654**	0.630**	
13. OC	2.84	0.72	0.091	0.061	0.023	0.042	0.086	0.647**	0.261**	0.565**	0.262**	0.860**	0.837**	0.845**

**p < 0.01. *p < 0.05

4.2. Discussion

The purpose of this paper was to disclose personal and job-related factors that shape OC among employees working in manufacturing industry. Results revealed very different findings regarding the two kinds of OC antecedents, namely personal factors and job-related factors.

The main finding was that none of the five personal variables, such as age, gender, education level, marital status and kinship responsibilities, were found to be related either to OC or the different components of OC. This is an important finding supporting *Meyer et al. (2002)* conclusion that “demographic variables play a relatively minor role in the development of organisational commitment, regardless of its form” (p. 38). It is interesting to note that the same conclusion was drawn in 1991 by *Meyer & Allen (1991)*, arguing that although demographic variables have been linked to commitment, the relations are neither strong nor consistent.

Concerning age as insignificant predictor of OC, the findings could be probably explained through a different generation lens. The majority of the research respondents belonged to the age group of 27–35 years. Contrary to older people, young people possess different values (*D’Amato & Herzfeldt, 2008*), see more employment options available and do not realise that leaving may cost them more (*Chungtai & Zafar, 2006*). It could be predicted that in the future more issues will arise, as new generations of employees enter the labour market with their own cohort-based expectations, which will cause new antecedents of OC (*Morrow, 2011*).

As regards the gender, the results provide support for most of the previous studies concluding that gender is not a significant predictor of OC (*Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016*).

It seems that education level does not play a relevant role in shaping OC. This could be explained analysing the education level of respondents. Almost 50% of respondents had higher education; as a result, they had more opportunities to change jobs, especially having in mind the issues of the labour market and labour force shortage in the whole Europe.

In contrast to expectations, no significant relationship was detected between marital status and OC and between kinship responsibilities and OC. Several earlier researches are in line with these findings (*Chungtai & Zafar, 2006; Joiner & Bakalis, 2006*). It could be argued that family responsibilities and the need to support children are not sufficient as reasons to become more committed to one organisation in the examined setting.

Correlations involving job-related factors were generally much stronger than those involving personal characteristics. As expected, H6, H7, H8 and H9 were confirmed. These findings corresponded to *Iverson & Buttigieg’s (1999)*, *Joiner & Bakalis’ (2006)*, and *Chungtai & Zafar’s (2006)* conclusions.

Supervisor support contributes to OC in general and to all components of OC highlighting the value of supervisor and co-worker relations in manufacturing organisations. The supervisors dealing with employees on a daily basis have the possibilities and the power to attach the employees emotionally, to influence the sense of their responsibility and/or to show the cost associated with leaving the particular manufacturing organisation. *Chungtai & Zafar (2006)* underlined that a supervisor represents the organisation to the employees and if the supervisor takes a personal interest, he/she will send a message to employees that the organisation cares about them. Such support leads to a larger pool of more committed employees.

Results referring to co-worker support demonstrated the existence of a positive relationship with OC, affective and normative commitment. In general, mutual support increases the employee sense of connection. However, no relationship was found between the co-worker support and continuance commitment. This indicates that co-workers are not so influential in revealing their colleagues what would be lost if the employment in organisation was discontinued.

As it was expected, role clarity is obviously one of the OC determinants. The results fit with previous findings (*Joiner & Bakalis, 2006*). Role clarity makes the organisation’s values,

goals, and expectations more identifiable and provide the employees with experiences of comfort (Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2011). As role clarity makes the completion of employee's duties easier because of expectations being more explicit, that leads to stronger affective commitment. Similarly, role clarity may be perceived by employees working in a manufacturing organisation as a 'gift' that calls for reciprocation, which is the basis of normative commitment and constitutes a favourable work condition. Going further, employees may not want to lose these working conditions, thus contributing to continuance commitment (Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2011).

The findings demonstrated that access to resources plays a role in OC shaping. According to Joiner & Bakalis (2006), access to resources subtly communicates to employees their value to the organisation. Lack of resources can signal a lack of organisational caring, which in turn can lead to weaker OC. However, the findings do not support the proposition that access to resources has a positive impact on normative commitment. This indicates that 'moral duty' and 'indebted obligation' are not influenced by having access to resources in a manufacturing organisation.

5. Conclusion

Following the acknowledgment that highly committed employees are a valued asset, the researchers and practitioners should find the ways to nurture such commitment. The paper aimed at disclosing the personal and job-related factors as antecedents of OC. The results revealed some doubts regarding the ability of age, gender, education level, marital status and kinship responsibilities to predict OC, as no statistically significant relationships were found between the mentioned factors and OC. The supervisor support, co-worker support, role clarity and access to resources, on the contrary, seem to have an effect in shaping OC of employees.

The paper provides several practical implications. Consistent with previous studies, practitioners will benefit from considering job-related factors in order to foster OC. However, personal factors should be treated with some caution as cohort-based expectations and desires, change in the labour market situation and other social challenges may result in a different set of OC antecedents that do not include the demographic characteristics.

The research has certain limitations that suggest directions for future research. It might be impossible to generalise the outcomes of the research to other industries, since the setting of work in manufacturing may be very different in comparison to other economic sectors. A large-scale study or study including employees from different industries might yield the results that could be transferable outwards. Finally, this paper did not examine the consequences of OC. Future research could further develop a holistic model that incorporates both antecedents and consequences of OC.

References:

- [1] Allen, N. J. & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 63(1): 1–18.
- [2] Aydin, A., Sarier, Y. & Uysal, S. (2011). The Effect of Gender on Organizational Commitment of Teachers: A Meta Analytic Analysis. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 11(2): 628–632.
- [3] Becker HS. (1960). Notes on the Concept of Commitment. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 66: 32–40
- [4] Cappelli, P. (2000). Managing without Commitment. *Organizational Dynamics*, 28(4): 11–24.
- [5] Chih, W. H. & Lin, Y. A. (2009). The Study of the Antecedent Factors of Organisational Commitment for High-tech Industries in Taiwan. *Total Quality Management*, 20(8): 799–815.
- [6] Cho, S. & Mor Barak, M. E. (2008). Understanding of Diversity and Inclusion in a Perceived Homogeneous Culture: A Study of Organizational Commitment and Job Performance among Korean Employees. *Administration in Social Work*, 32(4): 100–126.

- [7] Choi, D., Oh, I. S. & Colbert, A. E. (2015). Understanding Organizational Commitment: A Meta-analytic Examination of the Roles of the Five-factor Model of Personality and Culture. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(5): 1542.
- [8] Chughtai, A. A. & Zafar, S. (2006). Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational commitment among Pakistani University Teachers.
- [9] Culpepper, R. A. (2011). Three-component Commitment and Turnover: An Examination of Temporal Aspects. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(2): 517–527.
- [10] D'Amato, A. & Herzfeldt, R. (2008). Learning Orientation, Organizational Commitment and Talent Retention across Generations: A Study of European Managers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(8): 929–953.
- [11] Darolia, C. R., Kumari, P. & Darolia, S. (2010). Perceived Organizational Support, Work Motivation, and Organizational Commitment as Determinants of Job Performance. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 36(1): 69–78.
- [12] Devece, C., Palacios-Marqués, D. & Alguacil, M. P. (2016). Organizational Commitment and Its Effects on Organizational Citizenship Behavior in a High-unemployment Environment. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(5): 1857–1861.
- [13] Dunham, R. B., Grube, J. A. & Castaneda, M. B. (1994). Organizational Commitment: The Utility of an Integrative Definition. *Journal of applied psychology*, 79(3): 370.
- [14] EPRS, 2015. *Industry 4.0. Digitalization for Productivity and Growth*. (Online). (Cit. 2018-02-17). Available at: [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2015/568337/EPRS_BRI\(2015\)568337_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2015/568337/EPRS_BRI(2015)568337_EN.pdf).
- [15] Fields, D. L. (2002). *Taking the measure of work. A guide to validated scales for organizational research and diagnosis*. Sage Publications.
- [16] Fornes, S. L., Rocco, T. S. & Wollard, K. K. (2008). Workplace Commitment: A Conceptual Model Developed from Integrative Review of the Research. *Human Resource Development Review*, 7(3): 339–357.
- [17] Iverson, R. D. & Buttigieg, D. M. (1999). Affective, Normative and Continuance Commitment: Can the 'Right Kind' of Commitment Be Managed? *Journal of Management Studies*, 36(3): 307–333.
- [18] Joiner, T. A. & Bakalis, S. (2006). The Antecedents of Organizational Commitment: The Case of Australian Casual Academics. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 20(6): 439–452.
- [19] Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D. & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity*. New York: Wiley.
- [20] Kell, H. J. & Motowidlo, S. J. (2012). Deconstructing Organizational Commitment: Associations among Its Affective and Cognitive Components, Personality Antecedents, and Behavioral Outcomes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(1): 213–251.
- [21] Mathieu, J. E. & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A Review and Meta-analysis of the Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences of Organizational Commitment. *Psychological bulletin*, 108(2): 171.
- [22] Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the 'Side-Bet Theory' of Organizational Commitment: Some Methodological Considerations. *Journal of applied psychology*, 69(3): 372.
- [23] Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1991). A Three-component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. *Human resource management review*, 1(1): 61–89.
- [24] Meyer, J. P., Hecht, T. D., Gill, H. & Topolnytsky, L. (2010). Person–organization (Culture) Fit and Employee Commitment under Conditions of Organizational Change: A Longitudinal Study. *Journal of vocational behaviour*, 76(3): 458–473.
- [25] Meyer, J. P. & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the Workplace: Toward a General Model. *Human resource management review*, 11(3): 299–326.
- [26] Meyer, J. P. & Maltin, E. R. (2010). Employee Commitment and Well-being: A Critical Review, Theoretical Framework and Research Agenda. *Journal of vocational behaviour*, 77(2): 323–337.
- [27] Meyer, J. P. & Parfyonova, N. M. (2010). Normative Commitment in the Workplace: A Theoretical Analysis and Re-conceptualization. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20(4): 283–294.
- [28] Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L. & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization: A Meta-analysis of Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1): 20–52.

- [29] Meyer, J. P., Stanley, L. J. & Parfyonova, N. M. (2012). Employee Commitment in Context: The Nature and Implication of Commitment Profiles. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(1): 1–16.
- [30] Meyer, J. P., Stanley, L. J. & Vandenberg, R. J. (2013). A Person-centered Approach to the Study of Commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 23(2): 190–202.
- [31] Morrow, P. C. (2011). Managing Organizational Commitment: Insights from Longitudinal Research. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(1): 18–35.
- [32] Morrow, P. C., McElroy, J. C. & Scheibe, K. P. (2012). Influencing Organizational Commitment through Office Redesign. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81(1): 99–111.
- [33] Mottaz, C. J. (1988). Determinants of Organizational Commitment. *Human Relations*, 41(6): 467–482.
- [34] Mowday R., Steers R. & Porter L. (1979). The Measurement of Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2): 224–247.
- [35] Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W. & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organization Linkage. The Psychology of Commitment Absenteeism, and Turn Over*. London: Academic Press Inc.
- [36] Ng, T. W. (2015). The Incremental Validity of Organizational Commitment, Organizational Trust, and Organizational Identification. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 88: 154–163.
- [37] Ngo, H. Y. & Wing-Ngar Tsang, A. (1998). Employment Practices and Organizational Commitment: Differential Effects for men and Women? *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 6(3): 251–266.
- [38] Panaccio, A. & Vandenberghe, C. (2011). The Relationships of Role Clarity and Organization-based Self-esteem to Commitment to Supervisors and Organizations and Turnover Intentions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 41(6): 1455–1485.
- [39] Porter, L., Steers, R., Mowday, R. & Boulian, P. (1974). Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Turnover among Psychiatric Technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59: 603–609.
- [40] Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J. & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role Conflict and Ambiguity in Complex Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 150–163.
- [41] Schrock, W. A., Hughes, D. E., Fu, F. Q., Richards, K. A. & Jones, E. (2016). Better Together: Trait Competitiveness and Competitive Psychological Climate as Antecedents of Salesperson Organizational Commitment and Sales Performance. *Marketing Letters*, 27(2): 351–360.
- [42] Somers, M. J. (2009). The Combined Influence of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment on Employee Withdrawal. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74(1): 75–81.
- [43] Spreitzer, G. M. (1996). Social Structural Characteristics of Psychological Empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(2): 483–504.
- [44] Vanhala, M., Heilmann, P. & Salminen, H. (2016). Organizational Trust Dimensions as Antecedents of Organizational Commitment. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 23(1): 46–61.
- [45] Velando Rodriguez, E., Crespo Franco, T. & Santos, M. J. N. (2006). Nature and Antecedents of Organizational Commitment: Considerations for Human Resource Management. *Portuguese Journal of Management Studies*, 11(2): 75–96.
- [46] Yahaya, R. & Ebrahim, F. (2016). Leadership Styles and Organizational Commitment: Literature Review. *Journal of Management Development*, 35(2): 190–216.

Addresses of authors:

Dr. Živilė STANKEVIČIŪTĖ, PhD.
School of Economics and Business
Sustainable management research group
Kaunas University of Technology
Gedimino g. 50
LT – 44249 Kaunas
Lithuania
e-mail: zivilė.stankeviciute@ktu.lt

Prof. Eglė STANIŠKIENĖ, PhD.
School of Economics and Business
Sustainable management research group
Kaunas University of Technology
Gedimino g. 50
LT – 44249 Kaunas
Lithuania
e-mail: egle.staniskiene@ktu.lt